

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

MARCUS DEWAYNE WILLIAMS,

#2191711

Plaintiff,

v.

BRYAN COLLIER, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:22-cv-359-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Marcus Dewayne Williams, a prisoner of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell, for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.


All claims against Defendants Collier, Townsend, and Pace were dismissed for failure to state a claim on January 24, 2023. Docket No. 20. On February 9, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion by Defendants Aucker and Defoor for summary judgment (Docket No. 24) be granted. Docket No. 29. She further recommended that all claims against an unserved Defendant, Ofili, be dismissed on the same basis and that this case be dismissed with prejudice. *Id.* at 18–19. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff, who received it on February 13, 2024, and did not file timely written objections. Docket No. 30.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 29) as the findings of this Court. Defendants’ motion (Docket No. 24) is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. All pending motions are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 14th day of **March, 2024**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE